Case5:10-cv-00429-JF Document6 Filed02/09/10 Page1 of 8

1 2	COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP MICHAEL G. RHODES (116127) (rhodesmg@cooley.com) MATTHEW D. BROWN (196972) (brownmd@cooley.com)		
3	101 California Street, 5th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-5800	•	
4	Telephone: (415) 693-2000 Fax: (415) 693-2222		
5	Attorneys for Defendant		
6	FACEBOOK, INC.		
7			
8			
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
11	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
12			
13	DONALD SILVERSTRI, DAWN KEER,	Case No. C10-cv-00429 (JF)	
14 15	KIMBERLY MANCELLA, JILL SILVERMAN STRELZIN, and CHRISTOPHER LEMOLE, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated,		
	•		
16	Plaintiff,		
17	V.		
18	FACEBOOK, INC.,		
19	Defendant.		
20	ERIC MARKOWITZ, FRANK BLUEMENTHAL, LAUREN REESE, and	Case No. C10-cv-00430 (JF)	
21	BILLY STERN, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,		
22	Plaintiff,	DEFENDANT FACEBOOK'S OPPOSITION	
23	V.	TO PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES	
24	FACEBOOK, INC.,	SHOULD BE RELATED	
25			
26	Defendant.		
27			
28			
RD			

COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

1162727/SF

I. INTRODUCTION

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1162727/SF

Defendant Facebook, Inc. opposes the administrative motion filed by Plaintiffs in the above-captioned cases (Donald Silverstri, et al. v. Facebook, Inc., No. C10-cv-00429 (JF), and Eric Markowitz, et al. v. Facebook, Inc., No. C10-cv-00430 (JF)) ("Plaintiffs") to relate those cases to the case captioned Sean Lane, et al. v. Facebook, Inc., et al., No. C08-cv-3845. Under the criteria set forth in Civil Local Rule 3-12, the Silverstri and Markowitz cases are not related to the Lane case. The cases involve different issues and arise from wholly distinct events separated by two years. Lane arises from certain interactions between Facebook, the popular social networking website, and third-party websites that participated in Facebook's Beacon program. The key events in *Lane* took place between November 2007 and December 2007, which was also the putative class period. In contrast, the Silverstri and Markowitz complaints concern specific changes to users' privacy settings made on November 19, 2009 and December 9, 2009, two years later. Indeed, Plaintiffs appear to recognize this when they concede that "[t]he Lane matter involves discrete privacy issues from an earlier time." (Motion 2.) In addition to a lack of factual commonality, there is only limited overlap in the legal theories alleged in the cases. Because of the substantial differences between the two actions, the criteria of Civil Local Rule 3-12 are not met, and coordination of Plaintiffs' newly filed cases with Lane is unwarranted. Moreover, the Lane case may soon be resolved, with the motion for final approval of the proposed class action settlement scheduled to be heard before Judge Seeborg on February 26, 2010. (Note that although Plaintiffs' motion states that *Lane* is pending before District Judge James Ware, the case actually is assigned to District Judge Richard Seeborg, with discovery matters referred to Magistrate Judge Patricia Trumbull.)

II. BACKGROUND

The *Lane* complaint was filed on August 12, 2008 against Facebook and several other defendants—Blockbuster, Inc., Fandango, Inc., Hotwire, Inc., STA Travel, Inc., Overstock.com, Inc., Zappos.com, Inc., Gamefly, Inc., and John Does 1-40 (who are referred to as the "Facebook Beacon Activated Affiliates" or "FBAAs"). In *Lane*, the plaintiffs alleged that Facebook and the FBAAs engaged in a program to solicit, advertise, and market business transactions to Facebook

1.

Case5:10-cv-00429-JF Document6 Filed02/09/10 Page3 of 8

users and the users' friends without sufficient consent. According to the *Lane* complaint, under agreements between Facebook and the FBAAs, when a user accessed one or more of the FBAAs' websites and a certain type of triggering event occurred (for example, making a travel reservation or online purchase), the website relayed information about the user's activity to Facebook. In certain circumstances, the user's activity was shared with the Facebook user's network of friends on the Facebook website. The *Lane* plaintiffs alleged that by doing so, Facebook and the FBAAs violated their rights. The key events in *Lane* took place between November 2007 and December 2007, the putative class period. The *Lane* complaint alleged that the actions of the defendants under the Beacon program gave rise to claims under the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, the Video Privacy Protection Act, the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act, the California Computer Crime Law, civil conspiracy, and unjust enrichment. The *Lane* case has resulted in a proposed class action settlement, final approval of which will be sought at a hearing before Judge Seeborg on February 26, 2010. (http://www.cand.uscourts.gov/CAND/Calendar.nsf/572d47d88520f842882566a2007f2b59/cd0a 5c0f181b8b5988256a01005e0eeb?OpenDocument.)

In contrast, the *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* complaints were filed against Facebook on January 29, 2010, and arise from events in late 2009 that have no relationship to the Beacon program. These complaints assert that two changes made by Facebook to its privacy settings system decreased user privacy and resulted in wider access to personal information that users had included in their profiles and had previously been accessible to a more limited number of other Facebook users. The *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* complaints allege that Facebook's privacy announcement accompanying these changes was misleading and confusing. Plaintiffs' complaints do not allege two of the legal theories alleged in *Lane*—namely, the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act and the Video Privacy Protection Act—and, moreover, allege four causes of action which are not in the *Lane* complaint: violation of the statutory right of publicity, violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200, the common law tort of appropriation, and injunctive relief.

1162727/SF

Case5:10-cv-00429-JF Document6 Filed02/09/10 Page4 of 8

Although the parties agree that *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* are related to each other and should be consolidated, Facebook does not agree that *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* are related to *Lane*.

III. ARGUMENT: PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE SILVERSTRI AND MARKOWITZ ARE NOT RELATED TO LANE.

This Court should deny Plaintiffs' administrative motion because the recently filed *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* cases are not related to *Lane*. Under Civil Local Rule 3-12(a), "[a]n action is related to another when (1) The actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event; and (2) It appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges." Under these criteria, Plaintiffs' cases are not related to *Lane* and should not be transferred.

A. Plaintiffs' Cases do not Substantially Concern the Same Parties, Property, Transaction, or Event as *Lane*.

Plaintiffs' cases and *Lane* do not concern the same transaction or event as required by Rule 3-12(a)(1). The facts upon which Plaintiffs base their claims bear no relationship to the facts upon which the *Lane* complaint is based. *Lane* arises from aspects of the Facebook Beacon program and, specifically, events which occurred over two years ago. *See supra* part II. Plaintiffs' claims in *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* are not connected to the Beacon program, and instead arise from unrelated changes that Facebook made to its privacy settings in late 2009. *See id*. Although Plaintiffs make the generalized contention that that their cases relate to *Lane* because they "concern common legal issues of privacy" (Motion 2), Plaintiffs fail to point to any substantially similar transaction or event. In fact, Plaintiffs undermine their conclusion by conceding that "[t]he Lane matter involves discrete privacy issues from an earlier time." (*Id*.)

Further, the *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* cases do not substantially concern the same parties as *Lane*. Facebook is the only party common to the three cases. While Facebook is the sole defendant in Plaintiffs' cases, *Lane* names several additional parties as defendants, none of whom are named or mentioned in the *Silverstri* or *Markowitz* complaints.

3.

1162727/SF

1			' Cases Before This Court Will Not Cause Unduly ication of Labor and Expense or Conflicting Results.	
2		•	•	
3	Plaintiffs suggest that there might be duplication of labor and expense if this Court were to			
4	relate	relate their cases to Lane. But in addition to an absence of common transactions, events, and		
5	parties, there is only minimal overlap of the legal theories alleged in the cases. See supra part II.			
6	Thus, keeping the case before this Court would not cause an unduly burdensome duplication of			
7	labor and expense. For the same reasons, there is no risk of conflicting results. Moreover, the			
8	Lane case is at a more advanced stage and may soon be resolved. The motion for final approval			
9	of the proposed class action settlement is scheduled to be heard before Judge Seeborg on			
10	February 26, 2010.			
11	IV.	Conclusion		
12	Silverstri and Markowitz are not related to Lane under the criteria of Civil Local Rule 3-			
13	12, and therefore Plaintiffs' administrative motion should be denied.			
14				
15	Dated:	: February 9, 2010	COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP MICHAEL G. RHODES (116127)	
16			MATTHEW D. BROWN (196972)	
17			/s/ Matthew D. Brown	
18			Matthew D. Brown Attorneys for Defendant FACEBOOK, INC.	
19			11001110/0 101 2 0101101111 111222 0 011, 11 101	
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

1162727/SF

1 2	PROOF OF SERVICE (FRCP 5)			
3	I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of California. I am			
4	employed in San Francisco County, State of California, in the office of a member of the bar of			
5	this Court, at whose direction the service was made. I am over the age of eighteen years, and			
6	not a party to the within action. My business address is Cooley Godward Kronish LLP, 101			
7	California Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, California 94111-5800. On the date set forth below			
8	I served the documents described below in the manner described below:			
9	DEFENDANT FACEBOOK'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'			
10	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED; [PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS'			
11	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED			
12	(BY ELECTRONIC MAIL) I am personally and readily familiar with the business			
13	practice of Cooley Godward Kronish LLP for the preparation and processing of documents in portable document format (PDF) for e-mailing, and I caused said			
14	documents to be prepared in PDF and then served by electronic mail to the parties listed below.			
15				
16	on the following part(ies) in this action:			
17	Michael James Aschenbrener Michael Graham Rhodes			
18	Edelson McGuire, LLC 350 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 1300 Emily Fawne Burns Michael Lambert Emily Fawne Burns			
19	Chicago, IL 60654 Maria Ostrovsky 312-589-6379 Cooley Godward LLP			
20	312-589-6378 (fax) Five Palo Alto Square 3000 El Camino Real			
21	Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155 650-843-5000			
22	650-857-0663 (fax) mrhodes@cooley.com			
23	mlambert@cooley.com burnsef@cooley.com			
24	mostrovsky@cooley.com			
25				
26				
27				

COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

28

1162953 v1/SF

PROOF OF SERVICE: DEFENDANT FACEBOOK'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED

1	Mark Andrew Chavez	Thomas Mathew Corea
2	Chavez & Gertler LLP	Jeremy Reade Wilson
3	42 Miller Avenue Mill Valley, CA 93941	Corea Firm 1201 Elm Street
4	415-381-5599 415-381-5572 (fax)	Suite 4150 Dallas, TX 75270
5	mark@chavezgertler.com	214-953-3900 tcorea@corealaw.com
6		jwilson@corealaw.com
7	John William Davis Law Office of John W. Davis	Marc A. Fuller Frank C. Brame
8	4445 Eastgate Mall Second Floor	Michael L Raiff Vinson & Elkins L.L.P.
9	San Diego, CA 92121 858-812-2976	2001 Ross Ave. Suite 3700
	858-658-0072 (fax)	Dallas, TX 75201
10	john@johnwdavis.com	214-220-7881 214-999-7881 (fax)
11		mfuller@velaw.com
12	Shawn Hanson Jones Day	David Christopher Parisi Suzanne L. Havens Beckman
13	555 California Street 26th Floor	Parisi & Havens, LLP 15233 Valleyheart Drive
14	San Francisco, CA 94104	Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
15	415 626 3939 415 875 5700 (fax)	818-990-1299 818-501-7852 (fax)
16	shanson@jonesday.com	dparisi@parisihavens.com shavens@parisihavens.com
17	Alan Himmelfarb	Scott A Kamber
18	Edelson McGuire LLC 2757 Leonis Blvd	David A. Stampley KamberLaw, LLC
19	Vernon, CA 90058 323- 585-8696	11 Broadway 22nd Floor
20	323-585-8696 (fax) Consumerlaw1@earthlink.net	New York, NY 10004 646-964-9600
21	Somethic Factorial Market	212-920-3081 (fax) skamber@kamberlaw.com
		dstampley@kamberlaw.com
22	Joseph H Malley	Thomas J. Moses
23	Law Office of Joseph H. Malley, PC 1045 North Zang Boulevard	Brydon Hugo & Parker 135 Main Street, 20th Floor
24	Dallas, TX 75208 214-943-6100	San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 808-0300
		(415) 808-0333 (fax)
25	malleylaw@gmail.com	
2526	malleylaw@gmail.com	tmoses@bhplaw.com
	malleylaw@gmail.com	

28

1162953 v1/SF

2.

George A. Otstott, Jr. Ericksen, Arbuthnot, et al. 111 Sutter Street Suite 575 San Francisco, CA 94104 415-362-7126 415-362-6401 (fax) gotstott@eakdl.com Executed on February 9, 2010, at San Francisco, California. /s/_Linda A. Nafey_ Linda A. Nafey

COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

1162953 v1/SF

3.

PROOF OF SERVICE: DEFENDANT FACEBOOK'S
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION
TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED